

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

## ORDER

Before the Court is the government's Motion to Strike Defendant's Pro Se Motions [Doc. No. 78], which concerns two recent *pro se* filings made by Defendant on his own behalf regarding sentencing issues. Defendant is represented in this case by appointed counsel, who will advocate his position at sentencing.

Upon consideration, the Court finds no need for Mr. Carter personally to make written submissions to the Court. He has no right to hybrid representation in which he both represents himself and is represented by counsel. *See United States v. Hill*, 526 F.2d 1019, 1025 (10th Cir. 1975); *see also United States v. Chavis*, 461 F.3d 1201, 1205-06 (10th Cir. 2006); *United States v. McKinley*, 58 F.3d 1475, 1480 (10th Cir. 1995). Although a trial court has discretion to permit such representation in a particular case, the Court declines to exercise such discretion here.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the government's Motion is GRANTED. Defendant's *pro se* motions [Doc. Nos. 75 & 76] are stricken and will not be considered.

further. Any pertinent issues may be raised by Defendant through counsel in a timely and proper manner.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 26<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2013.



---

TIMOTHY D. DEGIUSTI  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE